

February 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S2081

the sea—such as taking water samples to determine the biological productivity of a given area, or measuring the input of energy from the sun as it varies from time to time and place to place. Unlike oceanographic ships, which are few and move slowly, maritime ships are many and move quickly. Thus, in only a short time, much of the sea's secrets could be learned.

Another research project awaiting money and talent is for a small area of the ocean to be analyzed closely. Dr. Eugene Wallen, the respected director of the Smithsonian's Office of Environmental Sciences, suggests the coral reef. "So far, what we know about coral reefs would fill only a small book. Yet over a thousand species live in or near them."

Basic to any progress in the seas and water is a merger of the nation's oceanic agencies. A National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency would combine the Coast Guard, the Environmental Science Services Administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and other agencies. Predictably, resistance to this move comes from water-logged bureaucrats who enjoy the present separation of empires and from congressmen who relish their petty power over the diverse agencies. The new Senate subcommittee on oceanography is currently holding hearings on NOAA; the idea is not new, but perhaps this time around the good of the oceans will win out over the good of the paper-shufflers.

INTEGRATION AND EDUCATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Concentration on Integration Is Doing Little for Education," written by William Raspberry and published in the Washington Post of February 20, 1970.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCENTRATION ON INTEGRATION IS DOING LITTLE FOR EDUCATION (By William Raspberry)

Racial segregation in public schools is both foolish and wrong, which has led a lot of us to suppose that school integration must, therefore, be wise and just.

It ain't necessarily so. It may be that one reason why the schools, particularly in Washington, are doing such a poor job of educating black children is that we have spent too much effort on integrating the schools and too little on improving them.

The preoccupation with racial integration follows in part from a misreading of what the suit that led to the 1954 desegregation decision was all about.

The suit was based (tacitly, at least) on what might be called the hostage theory. It was clear that black students were suffering under the dual school systems that were the rule in the South. It was also clear that only the "separate" part of the separate-but-equal doctrine was being enforced.

Civil rights leaders finally became convinced that the only way to ensure that their children would have equal education with white children was to make sure that they received the same education, in the same classrooms.

Nor would the education be merely equal, the theory went: It would be good. White people, who after all run things, are going to see to it that their children get a proper education. If ours are in the same classrooms, they'll get a proper education by osmosis.

That, at bottom, was the reasoning behind the suit, no matter that the legal arguments were largely sociological, among them, that segregated education is inherently unequal.

(Why it should be inherently more unequal for blacks than for whites wasn't made clear.)

In any case, the aim of the suit was not so much integration education but better education. Integration was simply a means to an end.

Much of the confusion today stems from the fact that the means has now become an end in itself. Suits are being brought for integration, boundaries are being redrawn, busing is being instituted—not to improve education but to integrate classrooms.

The results can sometimes be pathetic.

In Washington, blacks send their children (or have them sent) across Rock Creek Park in pursuit of the dream of good education. But as the blacks come, the whites leave, and increasingly we find ourselves busing children from all-black neighborhoods all the way across town to schools that are rapidly becoming all-black.

The Tri-School setup in Southwest Washington is a case in point. Of the three elementary schools in the area, only one was considered a good school: Amidon, where the children of the black and white well-to-do attended. Bowen and Syphax, populated almost exclusively by poor kids from the projects, were rated lousy schools.

Then the hostage theory was applied. A plan was worked out whereby all first- and second-graders in the area would attend one school, all third- and fourth-graders a second, and all fifth- and sixth-graders the third.

The well-to-do parents would see to it that their children got a good education. All the poor parents had to do was see to it that their children were in the same classrooms.

That was the theory. What happened, of course, is that instead of sprinkling their children around three schools, the luxury high-rise dwellers, black and white, packed their youngsters off to private school. Now instead of one good and two bad schools, Southwest Washington has three bad ones.

After 16 years, we should have learned that the hostage theory doesn't work. This is not to suggest that integration is bad but that it must become a secondary consideration.

Busing makes some sense (as a temporary measure) when its purpose is to transport children from neighborhoods with overcrowded classrooms to schools where there is space to spare.

It works to a limited degree when it involves children whose parents want them bused across town for specific reasons.

But it has accomplished nothing useful when it has meant transporting large numbers of reluctant youngsters to schools they'd rather not attend.

The notion will win me the embarrassing support of segregationist bigots, but isn't it about time we started concentrating on educating children where they are?

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE 1970'S

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States, Richard Nixon, delivered a paper, "United States Foreign Policy for the 1970's." To my knowledge, this is the first time that a President has discussed with the American people the broad program of foreign policy which his administration has embarked upon. Contrary to this, the whole general subject of foreign policy and its relationship to our military posture has been kept more away from the people than exposed to the people.

While the entire contents of the paper are more impressive to me, I was particularly glad to see the President spell out in part III, "America's Strength," which includes the shaping of our military posture, the process of defense planning, strategic policy and general pur-

pose forces. To me, the most succinct paragraph is the one that reads:

We aim for a world in which the importance of power is reduced; where peace is secure because the principal countries wish to maintain it. But this era is not yet here. We cannot entrust our future entirely to the self-restraint of countries that have not hesitated to use their power even against their allies. With respect to national defense, any President has two principal obligations: to be certain that our military preparations do not provide an incentive for aggression but in such a way that they do not provoke an arms race which might threaten the very security we seek to protect.

It is particularly important that the President made this particular statement because there are many people, including colleagues of mine in the Congress, who seem to believe that if the United States weakens itself militarily and refuses to honor its commitments around the globe, that we will be making a major contribution to peace. To those of us who feel opposite to those two positions, it is reassuring to be reminded that the President is depending upon the lessons of history which have shown throughout the entire time of man's life on earth that weakness has caused wars and strength has prevented them.

If this same broad, honest, and open approach to the interrelated problems of foreign policy and military strength had been adopted following the end of World War II, we would not have been engaged in the war in Korea or in the war in Vietnam.

I congratulate the President for his statement and I feel that this is the first major step in establishing an understandable and workable and respectable foreign policy for our country for the years ahead.

AMERICA'S FINEST ARE DYING FOR THIS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the militarist regime of Thieu and Ky, which we Americans are maintaining in power in Saigon, recently arrested 15 student leaders of Saigon University and closed two Saigon newspapers.

The students were accused of singing antiwar songs. Also, they held a meeting without a permit from the police chief of Saigon. They were jailed without bail pending trial. The crime of the newspaper editors was that they were advocating neutralism instead of supporting President Thieu and Vice President Ky.

Americans should know that the Saigon regime of General Thieu and Air Marshal Ky has either closed down altogether or suspended for specific periods of weeks or months 39 daily newspapers in South Vietnam. The majority of these newspapers had been published in Saigon.

Also, Nguyen Duy Trinh, who was Foreign Minister of South Vietnam, is under house arrest and may face a jail sentence for advocating a coalition government in Saigon. Truong Dinh Dzu, who was the runner-up in the election against Thieu and Ky in 1967, is still in jail. His trial for disloyalty to the militarist regime lasted 3 hours. His imprisonment has lasted 13 months. He was the peace candidate for President. Sai-

gon Daily News, the English-language newspaper which supported him was put out of business by Thieu and Ky. No wonder a majority of the people of South Vietnam are alined with and supporting the National Liberation Front, or VC.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN LAOS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, our involvement in Laos continues to be hidden from the American people.

Although President Nixon has referred to his 119-page report on "United States Foreign Policy for the 1970's" as "the most comprehensive statement on foreign and defense policy ever made in this country" it contains no mention whatsoever of Laos.

The newspapers of February 19 which carried articles on President Nixon's report also included a story about American B-52's bombing the Plain des Jarres in Laos.

The American people should not be treated in this manner. Once again the President has failed to inform the public about our activities in Laos. Once more the policy of secrecy is preventing the public from being informed about a war that is slowly but steadily escalating.

A recent editorial in the *Paragould, Ark., Daily Press* opposes the "secrecy" policy. The editorialist writes:

Won't we ever learn?

The U.S. got involved in the tragedy that is Vietnam because of failure to hold open debates in Congress on our involvement there, and partly through entanglements brought on by the operations of the CIA.

We cannot afford to let Laos and/or Thailand become Vietnam all over again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the *Paragould Daily Press* of February 4, 1970, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NO SECRETS

Just before their Christmas break, the U.S. Senate held a secret session to talk about U.S. military involvement in Laos and Thailand.

Week before last, more than a month later, a heavily-censored report of that meeting was released. It told us little about the extent of our involvement, and nothing about our casualties.

Sen. J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, did have a statement in the published excerpts—that "this is escalating into a major operation."

Fulbright's comment should be enough to scare anyone, even the hawks. Concerned senators pushed through an appropriations bill amendment to bar defense funds for U.S. ground combat troops in either Laos or Thailand.

That, however, is little comfort.

Everyone seems to know there is a strong U.S. "military presence" in Laos and Thailand. Anyone, at least who watches Bob Hope's annual Christmas show. In the 1969 version Hope, you will recall, commented on the "highly secret" mission of some units.

Many published reports, too, have told of U.S. air operations in support of Laotian troops. "Private" airlines, financed from CIA funds, reportedly supply arms, ammunition, and food to Royal Laotian troops.

U.S. Air Force bases in Thailand admittedly are used as operational points for raids on the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos.

There have also been substantial reports about U.S. personnel engaged in anti-guerrilla operations.

Won't we ever learn?

The U.S. got involved in the tragedy that is Vietnam because of failure to hold open debates in Congress on our involvement there, and partly through entanglements brought on by the operations of the CIA.

We cannot afford to let Laos and/or Thailand become Vietnam all over again!

REVOLUTION OF HOPE IN INDIA

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, when, in this age of megatons and megawaste, technology produces some tangible and unmitigated human progress, we ought to pause and savor it.

The "Green Revolution" which has occurred during the last 3 years in India and other developing nations appears to be one of these rare and hopeful occurrences.

And, while most of the credit goes to the governments and people of the countries involved, Americans were there when it happened. We were there with nearly two decades of economic assistance. We were there with food in times of scarcity. We were there with the unrelenting work of private organizations like the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and many of our great American universities, whose agronomists helped cause this revolution.

On February 6, the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* carried an editorial summarizing this historic event, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REVOLUTION OF HOPE IN INDIA

Without much fanfare except in the technical journals, a revolution of vast consequences has been occurring in India. For once it is peaceful and constructive, and it has certain counterparts throughout Asia. It is a revolution in the production of food grains which has brought India from the brink of starvation to a point of relative abundance in a few short years, and which has in the process revealed new facets of the Indian character.

As a detailed report of the Rockefeller Foundation makes clear, Indian subsistence farmers were supported to be "too sluggish, too unintelligent, too tradition-bound" to use new technologies even if handed them. But given something better to work with, these farmers "amazed not only their own government but the rest of the world." The speed with which they reacted, says the report, has never been duplicated on an equal scale anywhere else, including the agriculturally sophisticated United States.

The perceptive report was written by Carroll P. Streeter, for many years editor of the *Farm Journal*, who found that while India's approach to self-sufficiency in food is of key significance, "The real revolution is the one that has happened, not to farming but to farmers—the revolution of hope. It has meant a new concept of self, in which the farmer can believe he may fulfill his destiny as a liberated human being."

In the case of one crop wheat Mr. Streeter notes that the seasons of 1965-66 and 1966-67 saw the worst drouths in 40 years forcing India to import 10 million tons to avert

hunger and in some instances starvation. Yet today the Indus and Gangetic plains of northern India and of neighboring West Pakistan "are one vast carpet of beautiful wheat—short stiff-strawed thick in stand as level as though just mowed, heavy with big heads loaded with plump kernels . . . nothing less than miraculous."

The miracle was wrought by scientists who mixed wheat strains from various parts of the world to fit Indian growing conditions. And they have made similar progress in rice, corn, sorghum and millets. The Indians, along with wheat breeders in other countries, are working on a wheat-rye cross called "triticale," the first man-made species of grain with large commercial potential ever created.

Mr. Streeter credits four developments for the success of the revolution: New germ plasm which has given Indian plant breeders an abundance of material from which to breed more productive varieties of cereal grains; agricultural "inputs" such as irrigation water, fertilizer, pesticides and farmer credit; increased production of farm experts by state agricultural universities, and government-set price floors.

Having depicted the miracle, Mr. Streeter cautions against too much optimism as to the overall Indian economy, the reason being the birth rate. India's food supply is gaining at a rate of 4 per cent annually and has the capability of going to 5 per cent; about a million people a month are being added to the population, which now is estimated at 540,000,000.

What India has won is an important breathing spell and a period of a few years—perhaps as many as 10—in which to slow down the population growth while pushing food production ahead still faster. India has made small progress with birth control, but maybe, like the farmers and the new technology, the Indian people only need to be persuaded of its value. India cannot hope for long-range self-sufficiency in food until population growth is under control, and it is well that New Delhi is intensifying efforts along that line.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY UNDER THE TAX REFORM ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which was signed into law in December, was a significant step forward in providing more equitable tax treatment for individual taxpayers.

Several provisions in the new law, including a number of proposals which I have advanced, will also provide urgently needed relief for elderly taxpayers. This is especially gratifying to me, since tax relief for older Americans has been one of my major concerns.

In December, the Senate Committee on Aging, of which I am chairman, prepared a memorandum to assist elderly taxpayers in understanding the recent changes in the tax law which will be of particular benefits to them. This memorandum presents the information in a concise, readable fashion, and should be very helpful to older persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this memorandum be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TAX REFORM AND SOCIAL SECURITY

The Senate and the House of Representatives adopted a compromise conference report on the tax reform bill by overwhelming votes on December 22, clearing the measure for the

Approved For Release 2002/01/22 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000300010027-6

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE
TO: Mr. Maury		2/25/76
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS: Did you focus on the very clear way in which Fulbright has tied together: failure to inform the public, failure to hold open debates in Congress, entangling CIA operations. It is but a short step to say that all of this could		
FROM: [REDACTED]		(am)
ROOM NO.	EXTENSION	

25X1A

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/01/22 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000300010027-6

Approved For Release 2002/01/22 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000300010027-6

he carried of the Foreign
Relations Committee had
jurisdiction over CIA
activities - & I dare say
that - at the right time -
he could get substantial
public as well as Senate
support for such a
move.

Approved For Release 2002/01/22 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000300010027-6